

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 23 MAR 2005

WIPO

PCT

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing

(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 belowInternational application No.  
PCT/IB2005/050131International filing date (day/month/year)  
12.01.2005Priority date (day/month/year)  
22.01.2004International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F1/00Applicant  
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

## 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

## 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

## 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Meis, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2505



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/050131

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/050131

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43b/s.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-11
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-11
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-11
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**SECTION V**

1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the claimed subject-matter does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

A method of authorizing access to content by a sink device in accordance with usage rights, the content being stored on a storage medium controlled by a source device (and wherein the revocation status of the sink device is verified); a source device carrying out such a method; and the (computer) program of such a source device are common state of the art - see e.g. EP-A-1 376 302 (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) 2 January 2004 (2004-01-02) (source device with storage medium: 102, 104, ...; sink device: 114, 124, ...).

The claimed subject-matter differs therefrom in that, additionally, the version of revocation information used depends on whether the usage rights need be modified as part of the authorization access to the content.

The claimed subject-matter is therefore new (Article 33(2) PCT).

However, said additional features defined in the claimed, though to be included in the known method, device or computer program, actually do not have any effect on the known method, device or computer program, i.e. in the formulation of the claims, the additional features do not have any effect on the actual authorizing of access.

For this reason it is possible neither to determine the problem to be solved by the said additional features over the prior art, nor the technical effect provided thereby and presence of an inventive step in said additional features defined in the claims cannot be determined.

Hence the claimed subject-matter is considered not to involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

2. The claimed subject-matter is industrially applicable.

**SECTION VIII**

1. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).
2. Independent cl. 1 and 8 are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).
3. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the document D1 is not mentioned in the description, nor is this document identified therein.
4. The description is not in conformity with the claims as required by Rule 5.1(a)(iii) PCT.